REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-61 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,078,554 to Ootaki et al. ("Ootaki").

No claim amendments have been made in this response. Claims 1-61 are pending in the above-captioned patent application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) based on Ootaki. Claim 1, for example, is not anticipated by Ootaki because the reference fails to teach each and every element of the claim. In particular, Ootaki at least fails to teach the claimed "tracking means for moving said objective lens" and "region [of an electrode pattern] formed smaller than the field of view of said objective lens so that said region substantially stays within the field of view of said objective lens regardless of the tracking motion of said tracking means."

Ootaki is entirely silent as to the claimed "tracking means," as recited in independent claims 1 and 30. Indeed, the Examiner fails to cite any portion of Ootaki in asserting that the reference teaches this claimed feature. Moreover, since Ootaki fails to teach "tracking means," the reference is certainly silent as to the claimed "region [of an electrode pattern that] ... substantially stays within the field of view of said objective lens *regardless of the tracking motion of said tracking means*" (emphasis added), as recited in claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 30. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 1-61 should be withdrawn at least for these reasons.

In addition, Applicant notes the Examiner's assertion that Ootaki teaches the claimed "region [of an electrode pattern] formed smaller than the field of view of said objective lens" by disclosing "electrode patterns with respect to objective lens 5 in Fig. 4" and "electrode patterns 312b3 and 312b4 in Fig. 19." Office Action at page 3. "Fig.

4," referred to by the Examiner, is actually two figures 4A and 4B in Ootaki. According to Ootaki, Fig. 4A shows an upper transparent electrode 302a of an LCD panel 3 "for the purpose of DVD/CD switching" (col. 5, lines 62-65) and Fig. 4B shows a LCD panel lower electrode 302b, including electrode patterns 302b1-302b5, "for tilt compensation." Col. 6, lines 5-8.

During DVD reproduction (i.e., optical disk 6 is a DVD disk), lower electrode 302b is shorted to ground and a voltage of 3.5V is applied to upper electrode 302a. Col. 6, lines 59-64. As a result, LCD panel 3 acts as a transparent plate, and none of light passing through objective lens 5 is blocked. Col. 7, lines 1-2. In this configuration, Applicant advises that the inside area of the dashed circular line shown in Figs. 4A and 4B corresponds to the field of view of objective lens 5. As such, those portions of patterns 302b1-302b5 that provide tilt compensation are located within the dashed circular line, and the field of view of objective lens 5 is the *same* as the region in which electrode patterns 302b1-302b5 are located. Accordingly, to the extent that patterns 302b1-302b5 correspond to the claimed "region," such patterns are *not* in a region *smaller* than the field of view of objective lens 5. Thus, Ootaki fails to teach, during DVD reproduction, the claimed "region [of an electrode pattern] formed *smaller than the field of view of said objective lens* so that said region substantially stays within the field of view of said objective lens," as recited in claim 1.

During the other mode of operation described in Ootaki, i.e., CD reproduction, lower electrode patterns 302b1-302b5 (apparently the alleged "electrode pattern") do not perform tilt compensation (col. 8, lines 46-49), and, thus do not constitute "a region for advancing or delaying the phase of [a] light beam and correcting wavefront

aberration," as recited in claim 1. Further, Ootaki teaches that during CD reproduction, "only the middle-part circular pattern 302a1 of LCD panel 3's transparent electrode 302a" acts as a transparent plate. Col. 8, lines 27-29. Thus, according to Ootaki, "[t]his is equivalent to the case where [a] portion of the laser beam, passing through objective lens 5, which has passed through the circumferential part of [the] lens ... *is cut off.*" Emphasis added. Col. 8, lines 32-35. Applicant further advises that, as a result, the field of view of objective lens 5 is reduced to that corresponding to the solid circular line delimiting upper electrode pattern 302a1 in Fig. 4a such that, when superimposed in Fig. 4b, lower electrode patterns 302b1-302b5 would extend *beyond* the field of view of objective lens 5. Accordingly, even if lower electrode patterns 302b1-302b5 did correct wavefront aberration by advancing or delaying the phase of laser light beam during CD reproduction, lower electrode patterns 302b1-302b5 are, nevertheless, *not smalle*r, but larger, than the field of view of objective lens 5. Therefore, also during CD reproduction, Ootaki fails to teach the claimed "region [of an electrode pattern] formed smaller than the field of view of said objective lens so that said region substantially stays within the field of view of said objective lens," as recited in claim 1.

Turning to Fig. 19, which is also mentioned in the Office Action in connection with the claimed "region [which] is formed smaller than the field of view of said objective lens," the Examiner apparently also associates electrode patterns 312b3 and 312b4 in this figure with the claimed "electrode patterns." Office Action at page 3. With respect to Fig. 19, however, Ootaki is silent as to how far the field of view of objective lens 5 extends relative to these electrode patterns. In any event, Fig. 19 further describes tilt compensation during DVD reproduction, which, as noted above, entails the field of view

of objective lens 5 being the same as the regions in which patterns 302b1-302b5 are located. Thus, Fig. 19 of Ootaki fails to teach the claimed "region [of an electrode pattern] formed *smaller than the field of view of said objective lens* so that said region substantially stays within the field of view of said objective lens" for reasons discussed above.

In sum, neither during DVD nor CD reproduction does Ootaki disclose the claimed "region [of an electrode pattern] formed smaller than the field of view of said objective lens so that said region substantially stays within the field of view of said objective lens." Claim 1 is thus allowable over the applied reference and claims 2-29 are allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 1.

Claim 30, while of different scope, recites features similar to those recited in claim 1. Claim 30, therefore, is allowable at least for reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1, and claims 31-61 are allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 30.

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account no. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: November 21, 2006

By: _____
David L. Soltz
Reg. No. 34,731